



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 10**

1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101-3140

OFFICE OF
ECOSYSTEMS, TRIBAL AND
PUBLIC AFFAIRS

November 1, 2010

Bruce Rogers, Project Manager
Wrangell-St. Elaias National Park and Preserve
P.O. Box 439
Copper Center, Alaska 99573

Re: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) comments for Nabesna Off-Road Vehicle
Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
EPA Project # 09-021-DOI

Dear Mr. Rogers:

Our review was conducted in accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. Under our policies and procedures, we evaluate the environmental impact of the proposed action and the adequacy of the impact statement. We have assigned an LO (Lack of Objections) rating to the EIS. A copy of the EPA rating system is enclosed.

We concur with the National Park Service's conclusions about the impacts of the preferred alternative (Alternative 5). We support the selection of this alternative based on its ability to address the condition of most trails while continuing to allow access to subsistence and recreational users, as well as those with inholdings. We also support the Service's evaluation of potential eligibility of Wilderness areas as required.

We believe that overall the proposed trail improvements will greatly improve water quality and reduce the impacts to vegetation that are currently occurring due to trail braiding and generally poor trail conditions. We also believe that this alternative strikes a reasonable balance between the various requirements in ANILCA, the 1986 management plan, and Executive Order 11644.

We appreciate your efforts to put forward a clear and concise document that includes tables, maps and figures that assist the reader in understanding the various aspects of the alternatives and the potential impacts of each. We also appreciate the inclusion of a rigorous monitoring program to ensure that anticipated impacts are similar to those experienced in project implementation.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and provide comments on the EIS. If you have any questions or concerns regarding our comments, please contact Jennifer Curtis of my staff in Anchorage at (907) 271-6324 or by electronic mail at curtis.jennifer@epa.gov.

Sincerely,



Christine Reichgott, Manager
Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit

Enclosure

**U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Rating System for
Draft Environmental Impact Statements
Definitions and Follow-Up Action***

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO – Lack of Objections

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC – Environmental Concerns

EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce these impacts.

EO – Environmental Objections

EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no-action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU – Environmentally Unsatisfactory

EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potential unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1 – Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis of data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2 – Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3 – Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act and or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

* From EPA Manual 1640 Policy and Procedures for the Review of Federal Actions Impacting the Environment. February, 1987